

REMARKS

The final Office Action dated December 16, 2004, has been received and carefully noted. The amendment made herein and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicants submit that the amendments made herein are fully supported in the specification and the drawings as originally filed, and therefore no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-4, 7-11 are pending in the present application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Claims 1-4 and 7-9 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Abraham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,048,085, hereinafter "Abraham"). Claim 2 has already been canceled, and is no longer pending in this application. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the remaining claims, and submit that each of these claims recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art.

Claim 1 recites an encryption control apparatus comprising, among other features, a key generating means for generating the private key and the public key, and wherein the encryption control apparatus delivers the public key alone to the external device, and wherein the external device receives the public key from the encryption control apparatus to encrypt the data sent to the encryption control apparatus.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of the Applicants' invention.

The Office Action characterized Abraham as allegedly disclosing "an encryption processor (element 85)" and "storing keys in RAM (See Abraham Col. 6 Lines 64-65), storing authorization profiles (See Abraham Col. 9 Lines 15-22), and command authentication based on user profile in which a wait mode is used when the adapter is not in use (See Abraham Fig. 7)."

Applicants disagree with the Office Action's characterization of Abraham and traverse the rejection.

It is submitted that Abraham fails to disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claim 1 of the present application. In particular, it is submitted that Abraham fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of "a key generating means for generating the private key and the public key, and wherein the encryption control apparatus delivers the public key alone to the external device, and wherein the external device receives the public key from the encryption control apparatus to encrypt the data sent to the encryption control apparatus."

Moreover, to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single prior art reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Abraham fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by Abraham. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable.

As claims 3-4 and 7-9 depend from claim 1, Applicants submit that each of these claims incorporates the patentable aspects therein, and are therefore allowable for at

least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1 and 5-6 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ganesan (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,419, hereinafter "Ganesan"). Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled without prejudice, and therefore the rejection is now moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1 and submit that each of these claims recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art.

According to the Continuation Sheet attached to the Advisory Action dated March 29, 2005, the Examiner was persuaded that the claim amendments submitted, yet not entered, "would overcome the rejection of claim 1 in view of Ganesan."

As such, Applicants submit that Ganesan fails to disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claim 1 of the present application, and therefore is allowable.

Claims 10 and 11 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abraham, and further in view of Kashkashian, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 4,700,055, hereinafter "Kashkashian"), and claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abraham, and further in view of Double et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,027,397, hereinafter "Double").

As claims 10 and 11 depend from independent claim 1, each of these claims incorporates the patentable aspects therein, and is therefore allowable for at least the

reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Accordingly, Applicants also request withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1, 3-4, 7-11 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. Applicants also submit that the subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claims non-obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, and therefore respectfully request that claims 1, 3-4, 7-11 be found allowable and that this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper has not been timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300.

Respectfully submitted,


Sam Huang
Registration No. 48,430

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000/Fax: (202) 638-4810